

III. REMARKS

Applicant has considered the current Office Action of mailing date May 2, 2007. Claims 1-34 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1 – 3, 7 – 8, 13 – 16, 20, 26, 28 and 33 have been amended. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office. The present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the allowable subject matter noted by the Office.

Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of these original claims and other claims in one or more subsequent patent application that claim(s) priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116(b) because the Amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance as discussed below; (b) does not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and (c) places the application in better form for appeal. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of this Amendment.

In the Office Action, claim 1 – 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Couch *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,130,803), hereafter “Couch.” Applicant submits the following arguments in support of current amendments for the Office’s reconsideration.

Rejection of Claims 1 – 34 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

With respect to the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), Applicant respectfully submits that Couch does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example,

with respect to independent claim 1, Couch does not teach, *inter alia*, “... providing the identifier to a sender ... in response to a search in the routing system for the identifier by the sender ...”. Support for this amendment is found on page 9, lines 15 – 18 and page 10, lines 21 – 26 of the originally filed specification of the application. In contrast to the claimed invention, the UVDC’s “...existence ...is found only in and by the Host[, which relates the same] to the Subscriber and the Facility”, col. 11, lines 6 – 7. That is, the access to the UVDC in the Host database is limited to the Subscriber and the Facility. Furthermore, Couch discloses, in col. 9, line 27 – 28 and in col. 10, line 34 – 35, that a sender is given the UVDC address code by the subscriber. To this extent, a sender is not given the autonomy in searching for the UVDC in the Host as opposed to the claimed feature which allows the sender to search for a recipient’s identifier by providing access to the database for conducting a search. As such, Couch does not anticipate the claimed feature.

In addition to the above, Couch also does not teach, *inter alia*, “... responding to a request from a postal machine for the mailing address that corresponds to the identifier by retrieving a most current associated mailing address corresponding to the identifier from a referencing system of the routing system using only the identifier...”. Support for this amendment is found on page 11, line 19 – page 12, line 4 of the originally filed specification of the application. Couch’s method and system include a facility that interacts with a host, where the facility queries the host for further delivery instructions upon receipt of a mail/parcel. Col. 7, lines 5 – 9. Specifically, the facility accesses the database, of which it is integrated as a part of the UVDC addressing system, to retrieve such further delivery instructions. In contrast, the claimed invention responds to a request from a third party (e.g. a postal machine) on receipt of a

request for a mailing address, which corresponds to the identifier. According to col. 5, lines 51 – 57, Couch’s method/system is set to operate with the integrated “...Facility 140 [that] query the Host 120 ...[where] ...the Host 120 provides the Facility 140 with disposition instructions ...”. To this extent, Couch’s method/system is not designed to respond to a request from a separate/third party postal system as opposed to the claimed invention. As such, Applicants submit that the currently amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Couch and respectfully request that the Office withdraw this rejection.

In the same vein, Applicant submits that currently amended independent claims 8, 16, 20, 28 and 33 also recite the same claim limitations and are, therefore, not anticipated by Couch. Consequently, all dependent claims are not anticipated by Couch for their dependency on the respective allowable independent claims and for the respective unique features claimed. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw all rejections and allow the claims.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. These features have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 2, 2007

/Hunter E. Webb/
Hunter E. Webb
Reg. No.: 54,593

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

HEW/TC